



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/710,955

11/14/2000

David J. Anderson

BS00-143

6202

7590

01/12/2005

BRETT C. MARTIN
SHAW PITTMAN IP GROUP
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD
SUITE 1300
McLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

PHAM, KHANH B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2167

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n No.

09/710,955

Applicant(s)

ANDERSON ET AL.

Examiner

Khanh B. Pham

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 November 2004.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17,28 and 29 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17,28 and 29 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.
2. Applicant's submission filed on November 12, 2004 has been entered.
 - Claims 1-8 have been amended.
 - Claims 24-27 have been canceled.
 - Claims 28-29 have been added.
 - Claims 1-17, 28-29 are pending in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

Art Unit: 2167

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. **Claims 1-7 and 29 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bouve et al. (US 5,682,525 A), hereinafter "**Bouve**", in view of Hancock et al. (US 6,202,023 B1), hereinafter "**Hancock**";

As per claim 1, Bouve teaches a method for searching a database in an information retrieval system according to user-identified geographical location information, comprising the steps of:

- "creating a database for storing at least geographical location information for each of a plurality of items of interest" at Col. 2 lines 14-17;
- "receiving geographical location information corresponding to a location of a user's communications device" at Col. 10 lines 28-42;
- "receiving a search request from the user, and detecting whether the request is to search the database for items of interest located in a vicinity of the geographical location of the user's communication device or of a different geographical location identified by the user" at Col. 10 lines 28-42 ;

- “generating a search query for items of interest only within a certain geographical proximity of the geographical location identified by the user” at Col. 5 lines 14-21;

Bouve does not explicitly teach: “information regarding the different geographical location is pre-configured by the user at a prior time” as claimed. However, Hancock teaches a similar method for querying a database and providing information services to users based on their geographical location (Col. 1 lines 15-20), wherein: “information regarding the different geographical location is pre-configured by the user at a prior time” at Col. 8 line 60 to Col. 9 line 10. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bouve’s teaching based on Hancock’s teaching so that “information regarding the geographical location is pre-configured by the user”, in order to allow users to identify geographical location using easy to remember identifiers, or labels. For example, “Ms. Mary Smith may name her house MARY.SMITH.HOUSE. Thus, when Ms. Smith wants to direct someone using a locational service to her house, she identifies her location using MARY.SMITH.HOUSE, rather than a street address.” (Hancock, Col. 8 line 60 to Col. 9 lines 3.) . This modification “are useful as it keeps user input to a minimum, increasing safety, reliability, and convenience” (Hancock, Col. 9 line 9-11.)

As per claim 2, Bouve and Hancock teach the method of searching a database according to claim 1 as discussed above. Bouve also teaches: “the geographical

location of the user's communications device corresponds to the present location of the user's communications device" at Col. 2 lines 32-52.

As per claim 3, Bouve and Hancock teach the method of claim 2 as discussed above. Hancock also teaches: "the user's communication device comprise a mobile communications device and the geographical location information of the user's mobile communication device is determined by triangular of control signal strength received at cell towers surrounding the user's communication device" at Col. 3 lines 55-61. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Bouve and Hancock's teachings so that the user's current geographic location could be automatically determined without requiring user to input his/her location information or using an external location determining device, and the accuracy of the location information would be improved.

As per claim 4, Bouve and Hancock teach the method for searching a database according to claim 2 as discussed above. Bouve also teaches: "the user's communication device comprise a mobile communications device, and the geographical location information of the user's mobile communication device is determined by a GPS receiver within the user's communication device" at Col. 10 line 61 to Col. 11 line 1.

As per claim 5, Bouve and Hancock teach the method for searching a database according to claim 1 as discussed above. Hancock also teaches: "the step of generating a search query comprises calculating a radial distance surrounding the specified graphical location and searching for items of interest at geographical locations within the calculated radial distance" at Col. 30 lines 10-21.

As per claim 6, Bouve and Hancock teach the method for searching a database according to claim 1 as discussed above. Hancock also teaches: "the user's communications device comprises a mobile communication device, and the different geographical location specified by the user is a previous location of the user's mobile communications device" at Col. 26 lines 19-22.

As per claim 7, Bouve and Hancock teach the method for searching a database according to claim 1 as discussed above. Hancock also teaches: "the user's communication device comprises a mobile communications device, and the different geographical location specified by the user is a location known to the system and is then personalized by the user for a future search as a personalized landmark for a radial search" at Col. 27 lines 39-49.

As per claim 29, Bouve and Hancock teach the method as in claim 1 discussed above. Hancock also teaches: "wherein the geographical proximity is a radial distance relative to the geographical location identified by the user" at Col. 27 lines 39-49.

6. **Claims 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Bouve (US 5,682,525 A), and in view of Rennard (US 6,615,131 B1).

As per claim 12, Bouve teaches an information retrieval system for identifying items of interest located within a vicinity of a user-specified geographical location, comprising:

- “a database records unit for storing a plurality of information about a plurality of items of interest, including a name of each item of interest search, criteria associated with each item of interest, and a corresponding geographical location for each item of interest, and a corresponding geographical location for each item of interest” at Col. 2 lines 10-31;
- “a geographic locations processor for receiving a geographical location for searching the database records unit” at Col. 11 lines 3-14;
- “a database index for generating a search query including the geographical location” at Col. 2 lines 25-30.

The difference between Bouve's teaching and the invention of claim 12 is that Bouve does not teach a “ user-defined geographical location being pre-configured by the user at a prior time, by orally creating a specified name using a mobile communication device and associating the specified name with a geographical location while user is in the geographical location” as claimed.

However, Rennard teaches a similar method for identifying items of interest located within a vicinity of a user geographical location (Col. 2 lines 40-60), wherein: “user-defined geographical location being pre-configured by the user at a prior time, by orally creating a specified name using a mobile communication device and associating the specified name with a geographical location while user is in the geographical location” at Col. 21 line 45 to Col. 22 line 9 and Col. 13 line 62 to Col. 14 line 13. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bouve's based on Rennard 's teaching in order provide a safe

Art Unit: 2167

environment for inputting data and to reduce the number of input by users while using the system. As noted by Rennard, "it is desirable to provide an enhanced operating environment, in which the user is required to supply only reduced number of inputs, while using the navigation system. Thus, where a user is driving, for example, an enhanced operation environment provides important navigational output with minimal user inputs. It is thus desirable that allows a user to input complex information through alternative devices ahead of time" and "allow the user to input information by means of voice entries" (Rennard, Col. 11 lines 5-17)

As per claim 13, Bouve and Rennard teach the information retrieval system according to claim 12 as discussed above. Bouve also teaches: "a question generator table for prompting a user to provide a user defined geographical location for searching the database records unit" at Col. 10 lines 28-42.

As per claim 14, Bouve and Rennard teach the information retrieval system according to claim 13 as discussed above. Bouve also teaches: "the question generator table provides digitized audio speech signals as prompts to a user's mobile communications device" at Col. 10 lines 28-42.

As per claim 15, Bouve and Rennard teach the information retrieval system according to claim 14 as discussed above. Bouve also teaches: "the information retrieval system digitally encodes responses to the prompts to create the search query in the database index" at Col. 10 lines 28-42.

As per claim 16, Bouve and Rennard teach the information retrieval system according to claim 12 as discussed above. Rennard also teaches: “the geographic locations processor processes user-defined location information provided by a users mobile communications device, upon receiving an indication from the user, and provides location information to a database index for generating a search query” at Col. 21 line 40 to Col. 22 line 8.

As per claim 17, Bouve and Rennard teach the information retrieval system according to claim 16 as discussed above. Rennard also teaches:

- “geographic locations name encoder for receiving and encoding user-specified geographic location names corresponding to geographical location information provided by a user's mobile communication device” at Col. 21 line 40 to Col. 22 line 8;
- “a geographic location database for storing encoded user-specified geographical location names and corresponding geographical location information provided by users for future database searches” at Col. 22 lines 1-8.

7. **Claims 8-11 and 28 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Bouve** and **Hancock**, as applied to claims 1-7 above, and further in view of Rennard et al. (US 6,615,131 B1), hereinafter “**Rennard**”.

As per claim 28, Bouve and Hancock teaches the method as in claim 1 discussed above. Bouve and Hancock does not explicitly teach: “the step of detecting comprises orally creating a specified name using a mobile communications device and

Art Unit: 2167

associating the specified name with the different geographical location while the user is in the different geographical location" as claimed. However, Rennard teaches a similar method for querying a database and providing information services to users based on their geographical location (Col. 2 lines 40-60), wherein: "information regarding the different geographical location is pre-configured by the user at prior time, by orally creating a specified name using the mobile communication device and associating the specified name with the different geographical location while the user is in the different geographical location" at Col. 21 line 45 to Col. 22 line 9 and Col. 13 line 62 to Col. 14 line 13. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bouve and Hancock's teachings based on Rennard's teaching in order provide a safe environment for inputting data and to reduce the number of input by users while using the system. As noted by Rennard, "it is desirable to provide an enhanced operating environment, in which the user is required to supply only reduced number of inputs, while using the navigation system. Thus, where a user is driving, for example, an enhanced operation environment provides important navigational output with minimal user inputs. It is thus desirable that allows a user to input complex information through alternative devices ahead of time" and "allow the user to input information by means of voice entries" (Rennard, Col. 11 lines 5-17).

As per claim 8, Bouve, Rennard and Hancock teach the method for searching a database according to claim 28 as discussed above. Rennard also teaches the steps of:

- “receiving a name specified by the user for the specified geographical location; storing the specified name and corresponding geographical location information as an entry in a locations table” at Col. 21 line 40 to Col 22 line 8;
- “upon receiving a request to search for items of interest in the vicinity of a geographical location specified by name, (i) searching the locations table for the specified name, and (ii) providing the geographical location information corresponding to the specified name in a search query” at Col. 21 line 40 to Col 22 line 8 .

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bouve and Hancock’s teachings based on Rennard ’s teaching in order provide a safe environment for inputting data and to reduce the number of input by users while using the system. As noted by Rennard, “it is desirable to provide an enhanced operating environment, in which the user is required to supply only reduced number of inputs, while using the navigation system. Thus, where a user is driving, for example, an enhanced operation environment provides important navigational output with minimal user inputs. It is thus desirable that allows a user to input complex information through alternative devices ahead of time” and “allow the user to input information by means of voice entries” (Rennard, Col. 11 lines 5-17).

As per claim 9, Bouve, Rennard, and Hancock teach the method for searching a database according to claim 8 as discussed above. Rennard also teaches: “digitally encoding an audio speech signal of the specified name, wherein the digitally encoded signal identifies a specific location and is stored in the locations table” at Col. 21 line 40 to Col 22 line 8.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bouve and Hancock’s teachings based on Rennard ’s teaching in order provide a safe environment for inputting data and to reduce the number of input by users while using the system. As noted by Rennard, “it is desirable to provide an enhanced operating environment, in which the user is required to supply only reduced number of inputs, while using the navigation system. Thus, where a user is driving, for example, an enhanced operation environment provides important navigational output with minimal user inputs. It is thus desirable that allows a user to input complex information through alternative devices ahead of time” and “allow the user to input information by means of voice entries” (Rennard, Col. 11 lines 5-17).

As per claim 10, Bouve, Rennard and Hancock teach the method for searching a database according to claim 8 as discussed above. Rennard also teaches: “the user pre-configures the locations table with geographical locations at which the user intends to search” at Col. 21 line 40 to Col 22 line 8. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bouve and Hancock’s teachings based on Rennard ’s teaching in order provide a safe environment for inputting data and to reduce the number of input by users while using the system. As

Art Unit: 2167

noted by Rennard, "it is desirable to provide an enhanced operating environment, in which the user is required to supply only reduced number of inputs, while using the navigation system. Thus, where a user is driving, for example, an enhanced operation environment provides important navigational output with minimal user inputs. It is thus desirable that allows a user to input complex information through alternative devices ahead of time" and "allow the user to input information by means of voice entries" (Rennard, Col. 11 lines 5-17).

As per claim 11, Bouve, Rennard and Hancock teach the method for searching a database according to claim 8 as discussed above. Rennard also teaches the steps of:

- "requesting a user identification before storing a specified name and corresponding location information in the locations table" at Col. 11 lines 55-67;
- "requesting a user identification before searching the locations table, wherein the specified names and corresponding locations are stored according to the user identification" at Col. 11 lines 55-67 and Col. 21 line 40 to Col 22 line 8.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bouve and Hancock's teachings based on Rennard's teaching in order provide a safe environment for inputting data and to reduce the number of input by users while using the system. As noted by Rennard, "it is desirable to provide an enhanced operating environment, in which the user is required to supply only reduced number of inputs, while using the navigation system. Thus, where a user is driving, for example, an enhanced operation environment provides important navigational output with minimal user inputs. It is thus desirable that allows a user to

input complex information through alternative devices ahead of time” and “allow the user to input information by means of voice entries” (Rennard, Col. 11 lines 5-17).

Response to Arguments

8. The examiner wishes to thank applicant for pointing out the incorrect patent number provided for the Rennard reference in the Final Office Action dated May 11, 2004. The correct patent number for the Rennard reference is US 6,615,131 B1. The examiner apologizes for any confusion this may cause.

9. Applicant's arguments filed November 12, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner respectfully traverses applicant's arguments.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Bouve, Hancock and Rennard all direct to the method for obtain information from a database using a mobile device such as a cellular phone. Anyone who ever tried to input data using a mobile device such as PDA or cellular phone would recognize the fact that it is much harder, less accuracy and require more time to input the data from the cellular phone keypad, compare to inputting data from a desktop computer device. Hancock recognizes the problem and provides a solution using voice command:

"The' speech interface is used in a preferred embodiment to allow users to control the computer via spoken voice commands for promoting safe driving conditions while operating the portable computing device from an automobile or the like" (Col. 25 lines 50-55).

Rennard also recognizes this problem and states that "it is thus desirable to provide an improved operating environment that allows a user to input complex information through wireless device 202 with a minimal user input" (Col. 21 lines 40-45.) Rennard then suggest a method for inputting information into a database by allowing user to speak into the mobile device (Col. 21 line 45 to Col. 22 line 9). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bouve and Hancock's based on Rennard 's teaching in order provide a safe environment for inputting data and to reduce the number of input by users while using the system. As noted by Rennard, "it is desirable to provide an enhanced operating environment, in which the user is required to supply only reduced number of inputs, while using the navigation system. Thus, where a user is driving, for example, an enhanced operation environment provides important navigational output with minimal user inputs. It is thus desirable that allows a user to input complex information through alternative devices ahead of time" and "allow the user to input information by means of

Art Unit: 2167

voice entries" (Rennard, Col. 11 lines 5-17). Rennard's teaching of inputting information to a database by means of voice entries is appreciated by all methods and systems which required user to input data from a mobile device. Further, similar to Rennard, Hancock's system is also implemented as a "vehicular navigation system" (Col. 17 lines 35-50) and therefore both are in the same field, same intended purpose and operation.

In light of the discussion above, the combination of Rennard with Bouve and Hancock are proper, a prima facie case of obviousness has been established, the 103 rejections based on Rennard, Bouve and Hancock should be maintained.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon, if any, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

If a reference indicated as being mailed on PTO-FORM 892 has not been enclosed in this action, please contact Lisa Craney whose telephone number is (571) 272-3574 for faster service.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh B. Pham whose telephone number is (571) 272-4116. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Khanh B. Pham
Examiner
Art Unit 2167

January 7, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Khanh B. Pham', with a horizontal line underneath.